



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,489	03/01/2004	Serge Carillo	ST94037A/80375.0033	9027
29693	7590	07/21/2010	EXAMINER	
WILEY REIN LLP 1776 K. STREET N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20006			LONG, SCOTT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1633	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/21/2010	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/788,489	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CARILLO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SCOTT LONG	<b>Art Unit</b> 1633	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** REJECTED

(1) SCOTT LONG.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) DAVID KULIK.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 16 July 2010

**Time:** 4:15pm

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*New Grounds - Huibregtse*

Claims discussed:

1, 2

Prior art documents discussed:

*Huibregtse et al. (Molecular and Cellular Biology. Aug. 1993; 13(8): 4918-4927) and Huibregtse et al. (EMBO Journal. 1991; 10(13): 4129-4135)*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/SCOTT LONG/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed the applicant's representative that Prior Art was discovered which anticipated instant claims 1, 4, and 8. The examiner also proposed an examiner's amendment incorporating the limitations of claim 2 into claim 1, which would make claims 1, 3-8 allowable. The applicant's representative refused this offer. The applicant's representative began to discuss claim limitations which were not previously included in the instant claims. The examiner explained that applicant's representative's proposed claim language would require further consideration, particularly a written description analysis. The applicant's representative again refused an Examiner's Amendment based upon the pending claim language. The examiner informed the applicant's representative that as a result of the refusal Examiner's Amendment offered by the examiner, the cited art required the examiner to reopen prosecution..